

REMARKS

Claims 10-22 are currently pending in this application. Claims 10, 11, 17 and 18 have been currently amended and Claim 22 has been added as a new claim. Claims 1-9 were previously canceled, without prejudice.

Claims 10, 11, 15-17 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatenable over Hamerski et al. (U.S. Patent 6,120,867) in view of Bries et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/0009568A1).

Independent Claims 10 and 17 have been amended to more distinctly claim the patentable subject matter of the present invention. Claims 11, 15-16 depend from Claim 10 and Claims 19-21 depend from Claim 17. For the reasons discussed below, it is believed that these claims are now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner's office action asserts that Hamerski et al. fails to disclose "connecting elements such that the elements on one side of the folded strip interlock with the other side of the folded strip." In addition, the office action asserts that Bries et al. teaches a device for "applying a picture to a wall wherein the exterior surface has a pressure sensitive adhesive thereon and the interior surfaces are connected together either by adhesive or by connecting elements such that the elements on one piece interlock with the elements on the other piece." The office action further asserts that it would have been obvious at the time of the invention was made to "replace the interior of Hamerski et al. which holds the folded portions together with connecting elements such that the elements on one side of the folded strip interlock with the elements on the other side of the folded strip since this would allow the device to be **reused more easily**." The office action cites paragraphs 0006, 0008 and 0034 of Bries et al. to

support this motivational statement for combining Hamerski et al. and Bries et al.

It is respectfully submitted that the motivation of " reused more easily" is inadequate to combine the teachings of Bries et al. with the disclosure of Hamerski et al. for purposes of rejecting the presently claimed invention. Bries et al. teaches the use of reusable connectors for attachment of objects that are removable from a substrate surface, such as a wall. Bries et al. teaches the use of a reusable connector, such as Velcro, to enable the adhesive tape attached to an object, such as a picture, to be reconnected to another piece of adhesive tape that includes a reusable connector.

Bries et al. teaches the use of two separate adhesive tape parts that include mechanical fasteners, such as Velcro, to accomplish "reusability."

Hamerski et al. discloses a tape laminate with a fold (18). The fold includes first (14) and second (15) parts of a support layer (11). Means are provided for bonding the anchor portions (16)(17) to support an object on a wall. (col. 6, lines 1-15) As shown in Fig. 1, the use of a reusable mechanical fastener for first and second parts of the fold will not enable the device to be "reused more easily" because the device of Hamerski et al. does not include parts that are completely separable from one another. Therefore, reusability is not accomplished by modifying Hamerski et al. to include reusable mechanical fasteners as the first (14) and second (15) parts of the support layer. Furthermore, someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention would not be motivated to modify Hamerski et al., as taught by Bries et al, to include reusable mechanical fasteners.

In addition to the arguments discussed above, as currently amended, Claims 10 and 17, and all claims that depend there from,

clearly specify the claimed invention does not include a "leader."

The Applicants claimed invention provides the omission of an element with the retention of the element's function as disclosed in the prior art. As stated in the MPEP, omission of an element and retention of it's function is an indicia of unobviousness. MPEP 2144.04. Hamerski et al. and Bries et al. both disclose a leader used for removing the adhesive tape from an object. As discussed in Hamerski et al., the leader or tab can be stretched to remove the tape laminate from an object. (col. 3, lines 39-44) The Applicant's claimed invention has omitted the necessity of requiring a leader or tab for removal of the adhesive tape. Because the adhesive tape is one piece, removal of the adhesive tape is accomplished by pulling on the tape or the object the tape is attached.

Claims 12-14, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatenable over Hamerski et al. in view of Bries et al. as applied to claims 11 and 17 and further in view of Cejka et al. (U.S. Patent 6,106,922).


For the reasons discussed above with regard to the applicability of Hamerski et al. in view of Bries et al. to the Applicant's claimed invention, it is believed that these claims are now in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks above, Applicants ask for reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims. Applicants further ask for extension of the period for response to be extended three months to June 30, 2004 and authorize a charge to Deposit Account No. 01-1250 in the amount of \$ 950.00 for the extension fee. Order No. 04-0235. Should any fees be due for entry and consideration of this Amendment that have not been accounted

for, the Commissioner is authorized to charge them to Deposit
Account No. 01-1250.

Respectfully submitted,


Glenn E. J. Murphy
(Reg. No. 33,539)
Attorney for Applicants
610-278-4926

GEM/img
Henkel Corporation
Patent Law Department
2200 Renaissance Blvd., Suite 200
Gulph Mills, PA 19406